Cedar Grove Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cedar Grove Elementary School

2826 E 15TH ST, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: F (31%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Cedar Grove Elementary School

2826 E 15TH ST, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission at Cedar Grove Elementary School is to become unified and focused on motivating our students for a rapidly changing world. We will instill in them critical thinking skills and respect for core values: honesty, loyalty, perseverance and compassion by implementing the habits of highly effective people through the process of The Leader in Me. In doing this, our students will become productive citizens and contribute to our school, our community and our country.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:
Cedar Grove is building leaders today to empower the leaders of tomorrow.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wojnowski, Sheila	Principal	Coach team members Develop team strengths and improve weaknesses Identify team goals and evaluate team progress
Echols, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Professional Development Coordinator: >facilitates adult learning inhouse and/or online
Ammons, Yvonne	School Counselor	Leadership Environment Team Coordinator: >maintains a physical environment that inspires intrinsic motivation >creates a strong emotional environment with few negative student behavior issues >engages in event planning or publicly showcasing greatness
Bunch, Peggy	Assistant Principal	-Assist the principal in interviewing and evaluating instructional and non-instructional staff. -Supervise instructional and non-instructional staff. -Help create school-wide goals including those related to student learning and student behavior. -Manage student behavioral issues including those in the cafeteria along with those referred by teachers and bus drivers. -Supervise or arrange for supervision of student activities both during and after school hours including school assemblies, athletic activities, and music and drama productions. -Share responsibility for setting and meeting the school's budget. -Set up the academic schedule for teachers and students. -Keep track of all activities on the school calendar.
Bylsma, Cody	Teacher, K-12	Leadership Team Coordinator: >coordinates the implementation of the Leader in Me process
Sanders, Susan	Teacher, ESE	Achieving Goals Coordinator: >promotes the data-driven decision making
English, Carissa	Teacher, K-12	Students as Leaders Coordinator: >engaged with curriculum development >promotes the importance of social/emotional learning
Ferns, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	Leadership Team Coordinator: >coordinates the implementation of the Leader in Me process
Llorens, Yesenia	Assistant Principal	-Assist the principal in interviewing and evaluating instructional and non-instructional staff. -Supervise instructional and non-instructional staff. -Help create school-wide goals including those related to student learning and student behavior.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-Manage student behavioral issues including those in the cafeteria along with those referred by teachers and bus drivers. -Supervise or arrange for supervision of student activities both during and after school hours including school assemblies, athletic activities, and music and drama productions. -Share responsibility for setting and meeting the school's budget. -Set up the academic schedule for teachers and students. -Keep track of all activities on the school calendar.
Corley, Jerry	Teacher, K-12	Leadership Environment Team Coordinator: >maintains a physical environment that inspires intrinsic motivation >creates a strong emotional environment with few negative student behavior issues >engages in event planning or publicly showcasing greatness
Libby, Lisa	Teacher, ESE	Sharing Leadership Coordinator: >engages student voice in decision-making >engages students in "jobs" or roles >engages in student leadership teams
Cajote, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Sharing Leadership Coordinator: >engages student voice in decision-making >engages students in "jobs" or roles >engages in student leadership teams
Rivers, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Empowering Learners Coordinator: >promotes the belief of educating the whole child >encourages teachers to have students maintain data notebooks/parent conferencing
Peterson, Wanda	Teacher, K-12	Achieving Goals Coordinator: >promotes the data-driven decision making
Robinson, Baylea	Teacher, K-12	Leadership Environment Team Coordinator: >maintains a physical environment that inspires intrinsic motivation >creates a strong emotional environment with few negative student behavior issues >engages in event planning or publicly showcasing greatness

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 6/1/2018, Cynthia Walker

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: F (31%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1

Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	88	90	82	98	108	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	32	32	35	32	30	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	90	105	116	85	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	28	39	34	34	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	2	17	14	16	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	2	13	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	32	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	14	7	23	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	13	7	2	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	90	105	116	85	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	28	39	34	34	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	2	17	14	16	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	2	13	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	32	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	14	7	23	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	13	7	2	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	33%	55%	57%	40%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	59%	58%	52%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	57%	53%	59%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	25%	56%	63%	40%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	41%	54%	62%	58%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	42%	51%	43%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	53%	53%	23%	44%	51%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey						
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	27%	61%	-34%	58%	-31%
	2018	28%	57%	-29%	57%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	28%	58%	-30%	58%	-30%
	2018	15%	51%	-36%	56%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	32%	56%	-24%	56%	-24%
	2018	32%	50%	-18%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	25%	62%	-37%	62%	-37%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	25%	63%	-38%	62%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison	0%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	24%	59%	-35%	64%	-40%
	2018	31%	59%	-28%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison	-1%					
05	2019	20%	54%	-34%	60%	-40%
	2018	26%	57%	-31%	61%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison	-11%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	23%	54%	-31%	53%	-30%
	2018	34%	54%	-20%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison	-11%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	34	36	29	36	45	50				
BLK	27	61	85	19	45	73	13				
HSP	20			36							
MUL	50			36							
WHT	39	54		27	28	36	47				
FRL	32	58	69	23	41	58	34				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	32	44	56	33	33	29	27				
BLK	19	29	55	28	39	42	31				
HSP	50			42							
MUL	43	30		46							
WHT	31	39	60	36	35	40	41				
FRL	24	27	50	29	28	29	33				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	37	50	27	50	36	5				
BLK	26	49	69	25	43	33	10				
HSP	36			45							
MUL	53	64		53	55						
WHT	48	54		48	72		29				
FRL	40	49	57	33	53	38	15				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	320
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	28
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	43
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	39
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our students have consistently scored lower in math than in ELA across grade levels. Even with this, we were still at only 32% proficiency for ELA 5th grade, 28% for 4th grade and 27% for 3rd. In math, we maintained the same proficiency score of 25% in 3rd grade, dropped 7% proficiency in 4th grade and dropped 6% in 5th grade. Our students struggle with place value and developing automaticity in their basic facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication and division). They also have difficulty with solving real world problems using conceptional knowledge of basic operations.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Our math proficiency scores showed the greatest decline by dropping 13% points across three grade levels. Teachers are still not fully understanding how to implement Eureka Math and our students struggle with understanding the concepts. Time to fully implement the program continues to be a barrier as well. We had a lot of teacher absences in grades 3-5, which caused students to have less math instruction. We have teachers assigned to new grade levels and new teachers just coming on board. Their lack of knowledge in how to instruct in the curriculum has contributed to the decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our math scores show the greatest gap when compared with the state average. 3rd grade: 25% proficiency for Cedar Grove and 62% is the state average. 4th grade: 24% for Cedar Grove and 59% proficiency is the state average. In 5th grade 20% of our students were proficient; the state average was 54%.
As stated above we had numerous absences (majority storm related with students and teachers), we also had experienced and new teachers not familiar with how to teach the curriculum with fidelity. Finally, students were not able to comprehend the instruction, nor were they able to generalize what they saw in instruction to a different format shown on statewide assessments.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Seventy percent of our lowest quartile in ELA made learning gains. We focused on writing daily, reading complex text and asking higher order questions. We used Connect to Comprehension for our Tier III students, which is a program we have used for several years. The trend has been steadily increasing with this subgroup (lowest 25%tile) over the past two years.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Many of our students are still working through hurricane issues and the pandemic which has had a negative effect on their attendance and their social/emotional well being.
Our students who scored a level one in either or both ELA
and Math on state assessments are another concern. 103 out of 296 students scored a

level one or both state tests. Our students with disabilities, Hispanic students, and white students did not reach the 41% threshold for proficiency according to ESSA.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Students scoring Level 1 on either ELA and Math state assessments
2. Math scores dropping in the last two years
3. ELA and math scores approximately 40% points lower than the state average
4. Our Hispanic students at 28% of the federal index, scoring below all subgroups for consecutive years
5. Attendance and social/emotional

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students need reading and math strategies and skills to improve proficiency. Currently our students are scoring at 33% and lower in proficiency in ELA across grade levels. Our students have consistently scored lower in math than in ELA across grade levels. In math, we maintained the same proficiency score of 25% in 3rd grade, dropped 7% proficiency in 4th grade and dropped 6% in 5th grade. Our students struggle with place value and developing automaticity in their basic facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication and division). They also have difficulty with solving real world problems using conceptual knowledge of basic operations.
Measurable Outcome:	We will focus on our subgroups who were unable to reach the 41% federal index. These subgroups include: students with disabilities who we will target to improve their overall performance for 36% to 41%. Our next subgroup is our white population, our goal will be that they gain the 2% points needed to reach the federal threshold of 41%. Finally, our aim for our Hispanic students, will be to move them from 28% to the 41% of the federal index We will also focus on our subgroups in Math. The median percent proficient for our subgroups was 25%. Our aim in Math is to bring the three subgroups up by 16%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of the research based content literacy module block in the EL Education Curriculum. Teachers will teach the Module Block as well as the Foundation Skills (k-2)and the ALL Block (3-5). The Module Block will address grade level standards based instruction while the Foundations and ALL Block will assist students to fill gaps in their knowledge. Our ESSA subgroups will also receive intensive small group instruction using multiple instructional materials that include, but not limited to, the SRA Reading Mastery Signature and Connect to Comprehension which uses direct instruction to help students develop into fluent, independent, and highly skilled readers.as well as Do the Math for direct instruction to help students develop their number sense profieciency. The EL Education Curriculum® contains the following components: It is research-based and standards-based Enlists high interest grade level texts Promotes close reading Includes a writing component that builds stamina and endurance
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading Mastery Signature Edition® uses the highly explicit, systematic approach of Direct Instruction to accelerate reading and help students achieve a high rate of success. Connect to Comprehension® is a comprehensive, skill-based, scripted intervention reading program for struggling readers in grades 1-8. It is effective for small group intervention as well as for one-on-one tutoring. This program was developed to provide students who struggle with decoding access to upper-level comprehension instruction. Do The Math® provides flexible, classroom-tested instruction for building numerical reasoning and restoring confidence. It builds capacity as students move from basic

conceptual understanding to skills development in addition and subtraction, multiplication, division, and fractions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Action: Professional Development.
Activity:
a. Summer training on EL Education acceleration
b. Teacher ongoing review of curriculum during PLCs.
c. TNTP support in implementing EL Education
d.. ELA/Math/Science liaison meetings
Monitoring :
Sign in sheets, Lesson plan/PLC minutes template

Person Responsible   Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

2. Action: Ongoing District Coaching
Activity:
a. Literacy Coach's weekly visits to classrooms to the provide individual and grade level support in
implementing the Module, Foundations and ALL Block.
b. The district ELA coach monthly visits to provide feedback on pacing and teaching the program with fidelity.
c. The district math coach working with grade levels to implement Eureka Math with fidelity to assist with
struggling subgroups.
Monitoring:
Literacy Coach activity review, ELA/math Coaches feedback information, MTSS monthly academic meetings/MTSS spreadsheet

Person Responsible   Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

3. Action: PLC participation
Activity:
PLC weekly work in creating lesson plans for all subject areas
Monitoring:
Review of lesson plans weekly (see admin comments)
Administration support during PLCs (see lesson plan/PLC minutes template)

Person Responsible   Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

4. Action: Peer Coaching
Activity:
a. PLC presentation of daily lessons by each teacher
b. Teacher visits to colleague's classrooms to learn strategies
Monitoring:
Lesson plan/PLC minutes template

Person Responsible	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

5.Action: Differentiated instruction to meet individual student needs
Activity:
Administration visits to observe instruction
Monitoring:
Classroom Walk Through Forms (CWT), Lesson plan link to differentiated groups (MTSS tier groups)

Person Responsible	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

6. Action:Monitor Student growth
Activity:
a. Teachers/Administration monitor lowest quartile instruction
b. Provide small group instruction
c. ESOL para to support ELL students
d. ESE Resource teachers supporting classrooms
Monitoring:
Lesson plan/PLC minutes template, student performance on common assessments-see MTSS spread sheet -bimonthly, review student growth on MAP winter and spring sessions

Person Responsible	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

7. Action: Leader in Me
Activity:
a. Teachers will use the 7 Habits of Highly Effective people to build the students' self-confidence into the daily routines
b. Students will use data notebooks to monitor their academic, attendance and behavior growth.
Monitoring:
Classroom Walk through by administration, Student-led parent/teacher conference

Person Responsible	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

8. Action: Instructional Paras
Activity:
a. Paras support small group instruction in all areas of instruction
Monitoring:
Para schedules

Person Responsible	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

9. Action: Extra teachers to support Tier II and Tier III students
Activity:
a. Smaller class sizes
b. Support Tier II and III students with the MTSS process
Monitoring:
Class lists, Learning Academy schedules, Enrich progress monitoring

Person Responsible   Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Other specifically relating to Behavior (Mental Health)	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students deserve a safe and engaging environment in which to learn. We evaluated our current situation and found the following trends: 1. Students attempt to gain leadership among their peers which results in discipline issues. 2. Students are still recovering from Hurricane Michael...living in substandard circumstances or with multiple family members which affects their mental health. 3. Students have concerns and are missing a lot of time at school due to the pandemic. Because of the hurricane and the pandemic, our students do not have the skills to succeed socially. All of our students have had their learning environment disrupted, so they struggle with personal space, being attentive during instruction, and have missed basic foundational skills learning time.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to reduce the number of suspensions by 20% across grade levels using The Leader in Me process.. Using SY 2019-2020 student enrollment of 630, 41% of the students received one or more referrals. By Grade Levels, Kindergarten received 23%, first grade received 23%, second grade received 17%, third grade received 11%, fourth grade received 11.5%, and fifth grade received 14%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	This school will partner with The Leader in Me to support the staff/students/parents to develop SEL skillsets using the "7 Habits of Highly Effective People"
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	One of the most powerful tools in any school toolbox is a flexible, evidence-based, comprehensive Social Emotional Learning process. In times of uncertainty and adaptation, it is critical that both students and staff develop and rely on their SEL skillsets around change management, resilience, and teamwork. Leader in Me is the #1 choice for comprehensive Social Emotional Learning (SEL) according to the Tyton Partners. As an evidence-based K-12 model, Leader in Me grows personal leadership in students, educators, and families, and equips them with the life skills and resilience needed to thrive, adapt, and contribute in a dynamic world.

Action Steps to Implement

Action 1. All faculty and staff will attend a workshop/training of the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People
a. On-site presenter from the Franklin Covey Co.
b. Resources for teachers and staff for the workshop

Person Responsible	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action 2. Implement Leader in Me using On Demand Learning Modules as well as live staff development workshops.
a. Purchase license for access to modules and resources.
b. Schedule staff development workshops
c. Provide resources

Person Responsible	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action 3. The Adult Learning Coordinator will lead group discussions to deepen the learning, and the Leader in Me coach will guide the school to establish systems for successful implementation.

a. Schedule dates for group discussions
b. Schedule dates with LiM Coach

Person Responsible   Amanda Echols (echolab@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action 4. Provide resources for teaching the seven habits to students in the classroom.
a. Purchase Teacher Leadership guides
b. Purchase Student Leadership guides

Person Responsible   Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action 5. Provide a physical environment that promotes the seven habits.
a. Action team will develop a plan for the campus

Person Responsible   Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action 6. Provide opportunities for celebrating student successes/achievement.
a. Provide quarterly academic ceremonies
b. Post success stories on social media
c. Provide a bulletin board to display students' achievements in attendance, reading, team challenges, student of the month, grade level competitions, etc.

Person Responsible   Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Our areas of Focus are covered.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

By utilizing a school-wide initiative such as The Leader in Me, the administration, the faculty, and the staff will also include parents and community members in the initiative. With an emerging theme of leadership, the stakeholders will see this school accentuating the child's strengths, and using positive reinforcement to encourage leadership

and other desired behaviors.

Stakeholders will have opportunities to visit the school's positive environment/culture through open-campus events (i.e. Open House; Student-led Ceremonies), stakeholder membership meetings (i.e. School Advisory Board; PTO) , and student/parent/teacher conferences led by the student.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Behavior (Mental Health)	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**